

BOARD OF DESIGN REVIEW MINUTES

May 20, 2004

CALL TO ORDER: Chairman Mimi Doukas called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. in the Beaverton City Hall 3d Floor Conference Room at 4755 SW Griffith Drive.

ROLL CALL: Present were Chairman Mimi Doukas, Board Members Jennifer Shipley, Jessica Weathers, Dennis Collins, Ronald Nardoza. Board Members Hal Beighley and Stewart Straus were excused

Senior Planner John Osterberg, Associate Planner Liz Jones, Associate Planner Ethan Edwards and Recording Secretary Sheila Martin represented staff.

VISITORS:

Chairman Mimi Doukas read the format for the meeting and asked if any member of the audience wished to address the Board on any non-agenda item. There was no response.

STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

Staff indicated that there were no communications at this time.

NEW BUSINESS:

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

Chairman Doukas opened the Public Hearing and read the format of the hearing. There were no disqualifications of Board Members. No one in the audience challenged the right of any Board Member to hear any agenda items or participate in the hearing or requested that the hearing be postponed to a later date. He asked if there were any ex parte contact, conflict of interest or disqualifications in any of the hearings on the agenda.

QUAD 217 CORPORATE CENTER

1. DR2004-0020 – DESIGN REVIEW

The existing paving and truck loading area between two adjacent buildings will be converted into additional square footage by enclosing this space and relocating the existing truck loading docks to the east and west ends of the building. The proposal will create 2,065 sq. ft. of second floor office/corridor area and 10,200 sq. ft. of second floor office/corridor area and 10,200 sq. ft. of ground floor manufacturing.

Board member Dennis Collins indicated that he had visited the site specifically in connection with this application, and had no contact with any individual(s).

Associate Planner Ethan Edwards presented the Staff Report and briefly explained the purpose of the proposed application. Concluding, he submitted the material boards, adding that staff recommended approval of this application and offered to respond to any questions.

Observing that the applicant proposed a revised east elevation plan showing the removal of the second story window system, Board member Ronald Nardoza requested clarification as to which window system staff was referring to.

Mr. Edwards stated that he was referring to Sheet A3.2 – Option A, the east elevation, second floor window system, which was included in the original proposal.

Chairman Doukas noted that the parking on the proposed site currently exceeds the maximum parking requirement, and questioned how many spaces exceed the maximum number.

On question, Mr. Edwards responded that after the removal of 13 parking spaces, the site will exceed the maximum number permitted by 48 spaces.

Observing the significant expansion of the proposed building, Mr. Collins questioned if the facility enclosure will accommodate the creation of the proposed trash collection area.

Senior Planner John Osterberg suggested that the applicant respond to this question during their presentation.

APPLICANT: Andy James, with *Wise Investment Services Company*, the property and construction managers for Errol Station Partners, introduced the applicant, Marcus Morales, with *Ankrom Moisan Architects*. In the interest of full disclosure, Mr. James observed that Board member Jessica Weathers worked for an architectural firm, which the applicant, Wise Investment, was currently employed with on a project in Gresham, and explained that he was unaware of Ms. Weather's involvement with the Board of Design Review, adding that he's had no contact with her regarding this application.

Mr. James provided a short history and discussed the purpose of this project. He highlighted the building elevations with an oversized exhibit and explained the proposed alternatives regarding the east elevation second story window system. Addressing Mr. Collins' question pertaining to the trash enclosure area, he explained that the tenant, Vanguard EMS, have a "very aggressive" recycling program and believes the trash enclosure to be an adequate size for this project. Concluding, he offered to respond to questions.

Acknowledging that the applicant had submitted a revised east elevation showing the removal of the second story window system, Chairman Doukas questioned if there was a difference between the two west elevations.

On question, Mr. Morales responded that there is no difference in the west elevation; only the east elevation.

Referring to the revised window system, Mr. James explained that the applicant was requesting the Board to consider Sheet A3.2, Option B, which will include a solid sheer panel, adding that this was the preferable choice for the second story east elevation from a structural standpoint. He further explained that if the Board should decide that the east elevations require windows, it would be most difficult due to the volume of glass into the wall; thus precluding the wall from performing structurally.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY:

No member of the public testified with regard to this application.

Observing that staff had recommended that the applicant maintain the original design of the east elevations, Mr. Nardozza questioned if staff was comfortable with the removal of the second story window system.

On question, Mr. Edwards stated that staff believed there to be an advantage with natural lights inside the building coming through the elevation even if it's not entirely visible from the exterior.

The public portion of the Public Hearing was closed.

Disclosing that she was partial to the idea of a building having windows, Chairman Doukas acknowledged that this was not what the applicant wished to propose. She added that this was not a "community design issue", and noted that it was not within the Boards' realm to require that the applicant provide natural light in internal spaces.

Board member Jennifer Shipley concurred with Chairman Doukas' statement adding that if the building was more of an office space, than the idea of adding windows would seem more critical to have the quantity of light on windows on both sides.

Mr. Nardozza **MOVED** and Ms. Shipley **SECONDED** a motion for approval of DR2004-0020 QUAD 217 CORPORATE CENTER, based upon the testimony, reports and exhibits and new evidence presented during the Public Hearings on the matter, and upon the background facts, findings and conclusions found in the Staff Report dated May 13, 2004, including Conditions of Approval 1 through 13.

Mr. Osterberg recommended that the consensus of the Board be made clear to reflect the Boards preference on the window issue as either Option A or B; as this decision will be reflected in the final order.

Mr. Nardozza made a friendly amendment to the main motion that acknowledged the finding East Elevation Option B to be reflected in the final order. Ms. Shipley **SECONDED**.

Motion CARRIED by the following vote:

AYES: Nardozza, Shipley, Collins, Weathers, and Doukas.
NAYS: None.
ABSTAIN: None.
ABSENT: Beighley and Straus.

Motion CARRIED unanimously.

EMPORIUM REMODEL @ CEDAR HILLS CROSSING

1. DR2004-0022 – DESIGN REVIEW THREE
2. TP2004-0007 – TREE PLAN TWO

The applicant is requesting Design Review Three and Tree Plan Two approval for the reconfiguration and remodel of the existing Emporium building, located in the southwestern portion of the mall. The existing building is vacant and approximately 41,800 square feet. The applicant proposes to reduce the building size in order to move the front of the building closer to the surrounding storefronts and to remodel the building to accommodate multiple tenants. The Design Review application includes the proposal of associated landscaping, sidewalk and parking modifications. Tree Plan Two approval is requested for the removal of 10 landscape trees and the relocation of 7 existing trees located within the vicinity of the proposed modifications.

Observing that she is associated with regard to this proposal, Chairman Doukas recused herself from participating in this decision and left the dais. She handed the gavel to Mr. Nardozza.

Board member Dennis Collins indicated that he had visited the site specifically in connection with this application, and had no contact with any individual(s).

Associate Planner Liz Jones presented the Staff Reports briefly explaining the purpose associated with these applications. She referred to a Staff Memorandum that had been distributed, dated May 20, 2004, which explained supplemental findings made by the Facility Review Committee regarding the parking calculations and refuse staging area. As stated in the memo, the applicant had submitted the necessary information that does demonstrate compliance with the Facilities Review Technical Criteria No's 4 and 5. Concluding, she submitted the material board and added that staff recommended approval for these applications, and offered to respond to questions.

APPLICANT: Mark Perniconi with *CE John Company, Inc.*, introduced Gary Rommel and Philip Stewart with *The Rommel Architectural Partnership*. He stated that he has

reviewed the Staff Reports and concurred with the findings, and the recommended approval that are recommended by the staff.

Mr. Perniconi provided a brief overview of the proposed redevelopment activity. He explained that most of the redevelopment of Beaverton Mall (now called Cedar Hills Crossing) had been completed, and using oversized exhibits, he proposed two elevations for review. Observing that there had been issues in regards to obtaining the lease for the Emporium, he stated that he's not certain as to the final tenant make up of the remodeled areas. He described the first set of elevations that will serve a smaller tenant make-up with additional doors to serve each tenant. The second set of elevations will accommodate a larger tenant with less doors and glazing. He mentioned that there will be a minor modification to the loading dock on the southwestern corner of the building that will reduce the overall square footage of the tenant space by reconfiguring the building and dividing the space.

Mr. Rommel explained the minor changes to the original elevations submitted in 2001, and described the building design of the two proposed sets of elevations, which will remain consistent with the previous mall redevelopment. Concluding, he offered to respond to questions.

Ms. Shipley questioned if the trees along the east elevation will tie-in to the façade of the building.

Mr. Rommel stated that there are currently rows of trees that are in front of the building and added that the applicant will maintain that concept.

Referring to the two sets of proposed elevations, Ms. Shipley questioned if the choice between said elevations was dependant upon the tenant.

Mr. Perniconi explained that the applicant was uncertain of the final tenant make-up, adding that this was the reasoning behind the two sets of proposed elevations.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY:

No member of the public testified with regard to this application.

The public portion of the Public Hearing was closed.

Ms. Weathers **MOVED** and Ms. Shipley **SECONDED** a motion for approval of DR2004-0022 EMPORIUM REMODEL @ CEDAR HILLS CROSSING based upon the testimony, reports and exhibits and new evidence presented during the Public Hearings on the matter, and upon the background facts, findings and conclusions found in the Staff Report dated May 13, 2004 including Conditions No. 1 through 19.

Motion CARRIED by the following vote:

AYES: Weathers, Shipley, Collins, and Nardozza.
NAYS: None.
ABSTAIN: None.
ABSENT: Beighley and Straus.

Motion CARRIED unanimously.

Ms. Weathers **MOVED** and Ms. Shipley **SECONDED** a motion for approval of TP2004-0007 EMPORIUM REMODEL @ CEDAR HILLS CROSSING based upon the testimony, reports and exhibits and new evidence presented during the Public Hearings on the matter, and upon the background facts, findings and conclusions found in the Staff Report dated May 13, 2004, including Conditions No. 1 through 4.

Motion CARRIED by the following vote:

AYES: Weathers, Shipley, Collins, and Nardozza.
NAYS: None.
ABSTAIN: None.
ABSENT: Beighley and Straus.

Motion CARRIED unanimously.

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS:

The meeting adjourned at 7:46 p.m.